DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 532 SP 017 152

AUTHOR Rush, Wilmer Sherman
TITLE Learner/Instructional Characteristics and Student Ratings of College Teachers.
PUB DATE 9 May 80
NOTE 35p.: Paper presented at the Symposium on Education sponsored by the Northern Illinois Association for Educational Research, Evaluation and Educational Development (Bloomingdale, IL, May 9, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: College Faculty: College Instruction: Education Majors: Higher Education: *Role Perception: *Student Characteristics: *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance: Student Motivation: *Student Needs: *Student Teacher Relationship: Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Characteristics: Teacher Effectiveness: Teaching Methods: Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Based on theory and previous research done on the factors that affect student ratings of college instruction, it seems clear that different types of students prefer different types of instructors. The type is apparently a function of naturally occurring needs in the students' personalities and naturally occurring teacher behaviors which student perceive as meeting their needs, whether or not they are aware of such a matchup. Five hundred teacher education students over a four-year period were asked to rank four brief descriptions of teaching styles in the order that they would rate them if teachers following each style were among their teachers at that time. "Control" teachers were highly organized, stressed order, neatness, clarity, and logic, and encouraged deliberation of thought and moderation of emotion. "Intellectual striving" teachers challenged mental abilities and student motivation, provided problem-solving tasks requiring integration of learning, and evaluated students against a criterion of excellence. "Gregaricus-dependent" teachers encouraged students to work together, stressed sensitivity among students, and provided reassurance and support. "Ascendancy" teachers encouraged arguments and debates among students and created situations for peer criticism. Sizable proportions of students rated the control, intellectual striving, and gregarious-dependent teaching styles highly. Suggestions are made for the strategic use of each finding. (Author/CJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195532

ABSTRACT

LEARNER/INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STUDENT RATINGS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

Wilmer Sherman Rush
Professor of Education
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Five hundred teacher education students over a four-year period were asked to rank four brief descriptions of teaching styles in the order they would rate them if teachers following each style were among their teachers at that time. Based on the theory and previous research done on the factors that affect student ratings of college instruction, some conclusions were drawn with regard to student personality need-structures apparently reflected in the data. Sizable proportions of subjects, in about the same relative proportions each year, rated each of three teaching styles highly. Suggestions were made about the strategic use of each finding. Twenty nine references were extensively reviewed and cited.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wilmer Sherman Rush

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was presented at the 1980 Symposium on Education sponsored by the Northern Illinois Association for Educational Research, Evaluation and Educational Development (NIAERED), Bloomingdale, Illinois, May 9, 1980.

SP 017 152

LEARNER/INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND STUDENT RATINGS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

Wilmer S. Rush

Controversy, heated dialogue, and continuing investigations, opinions, measurement and analyses of college student characteristics and the teaching/learning that goes on in colleges have been earmarks of the great concern of college teachers over the importance of student ratings of their effectiveness and the uses made of such ratings. While few deny the right of students to rate their teachers (although there are some who reject the entire enterprise on philosophical grounds), many are they who view student ratings as of minor and spurious importance, at best, and vigorously oppose any attempts to promote such ratings to be major determinants of professional status. This paper presents a review of some re-occurring notions found in the literature on the title topic and the results of an original study by the writer at Western Illinois University.

General College Student Characteristics

In writing about college as part of personal development, Margaret Fisher and Jeanne Noble (1960) had these comments about the roles played by students and their teachers. "....The roles played by students and teachers are reciprocal. Each must understand and accept the other's role in order to play his own part effectively...." (10, page 156)

They further indicated that many college students are prone to suffer misconceptions about the teacher's role based on the larger misconception of

the role of adults. "....First, some students fail to understand or accept an independent role.... They cannot understand or accept a role in which they respond to a teacher who encourages independence.... Their academic performance is spoken of as something the teacher does to them.... To such a student, the teacher....will appear unfair, unjust, harsh...." (10, page 157)

"....A second immature reaction of students is to conceive of learning as a contest between students and teachers.... It is the habit of cheating and the preference for deception that represent a faulty conception of the roles of student and teacher.... If a student takes on a teacher as an antagonist, he is very likely to lose the contest...." (10, page 158)

"....Students often have a faulty notion of the teacher's authority.... Teachers do have authority....in the classroom....in his field.... In viewing the teacher as an authority figure....an antagonist ...a hostile person,.... they try to escape by evasion or deception...." (10, page 159-60)

"....A fourth misconception....appears in the faulty use of the teacher as a model.... College teachers are good models to follow in establishing patterns of adult behavior.... College teachers are mostly good citizens.... They have fairly solid status....but....trying to slavishly imitate a teacher's style prevents the student from developing a style of his own.... An adoption by the student of his image of the teacher as a kind of idealized self....is courting disaster. He cannot really know what the teacher is like, so he can never be satisfied with himself...." (10, page 160-1)

"....A more serious fault is rejection of teachers as models in favor of other models of adult behavior....may lead to outright anti-intellectualism.... Sometimes it is selective....acceptance of certain aspects and behavior but open rejection of others.... They are often sadly disorganized in their habits of study and are unable to produce consistent work.... They do not understand or accept the

status that teachers have.... They never identify (or identify too strongly) with the status symbols college teachers have to choose from.... Actual selectivity in use of the teacher as a model is desirable. The college professor is no plaster saint.... Their own role will be easier to play if they see him as a human being from whom they can learn, not as an idealized self that drives and demands...." (10, page 162-4)

"....Students often see the teacher as an entertainer and expect to be amused or diverted in class.... Some students settle for spurious enjoyment, treating the teacher's lectures as entertainment, responding only to shocking or exciting ideas, trying to identify the professor's pet ideas and opinions instead of drawing their own conclusions....learning is not a spectator sport.... Students do find that systematic evaluation of their experience with particular teachers tends to make them think more seriously about the process of teaching and learning rather than the personalities involved...." (10, page 164-5)

The forgoing reflects the long experience of the authors in working with college students. Almost any college teacher today will surely recognize some of his current and former students in the descriptions cited above. While they may appear to be biased and of a negative tone, the writer's experience would lead him to accept the descriptions as reflective of real probabilities today, as well as two decades ago.

Esther Raushenbush (1964) expressed the frustration felt by many college teachers when she wrote: "....Studies of students pile up evidence that too many....work casually, although often well enough so no one knows the difference, drift in the college, or drift out, make attachments that present them from involving themselves in their work....but give us little indication of what professors, educational philosophers, or the curricula do to cope with this condition...." (20, page 150)

Mervin Freedman (1967) objected to all those who think that very little can be done when he wrote: "....Many writings in psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and psychology seem to suggest that there are two kinds of college students: those who are normal and ready to be educated, and those who are neurotic and need psychotherapy as well as education. This traditional view....comes from assigning overweening importance to the events of infancy and early childhood...." (11, page 24)

"....The situation of the college student....would appear to be highly favorable to change.... One or several courses, a friendship with a fellow student, reading the poems....or a relationship with a faculty member can alter the personality in dramatic ways, initiating changes that may persist over a lifetime...." (11, page 25)

Daniel Yankelovich (1974) and Thomas J. Cottle (1977) maintain that today's college student really is not so different. Each has attempted to describe the student of the 70's as having the same goals, but perhaps for different reasons or using a different rationale for achievement. Yankelovich wrote: "....Most college students accept the necessity for hard work as a fact of life. They do not shirk it or shrink from it. At the same time, what they regard as the proper pay-off for hard work has shifted dramatically. Students specifically reject a nose-to-the-grindstone philosophy of life. They do not subscribe to the old credo that, if they work hard, stay out of trouble, and put their responsibilities....ahead of their own personal satisfaction, they will then be rewarded with good living, economic security, enough money to buy possessions, a nice place to live, and a good education for their kids. What we see instead is the active pursuit of a career as a means of self-fulfillment, with money, security, and possessions included in the overall scheme, partly taken for granted, partly demanded as a matter of right, but subordinate to the main goal of finding

just the right life style for expressing their psychological potential...." (29, page 21)

Cottle wrote almost in the same terms, but introduced a possible explanation for their apparent confusion or for the confusion perceived by others to characterize today's college students. "....Despite messages to the contrary, the dream of achievement and success, the affirmation of personal worth through one's work--especially work that demands personal expression--and the desire to be accepted and still free to run alone is very much alive today.... The desire to achieve remains intact...." (6, page 185)

"....The conflict of social or political action and career....reflects much of the ambivalence of many students with their parents and teachers and their parents' and teacher's conceptions of education and career. For many, the confusion fails to recede because they want to be like their parents (and teachers) and not like them at the same time...." (6, page 187)

In view of one of the studies reviewed later in this paper and the original study reported in this paper, Cottle's assessment appears reasonable since the Gregariousness-Dependence need structure factor (including autonomy) was a major determinant in the ratings of teachers by students.

Robert J. Menges, whose paper was included in a book edited by C. Robert Pace (1973), had this to say about students rating teachers and some characteristics he felt would describe the situation almost anywhere. "....The student concern for improving teaching on campus is genuine. So is their belief that publicly identifying weaker teachers will produce improvement. However, their technique assumes that all faculty could teach better if they would only try harder and work at it more.... The best and worst judged teachers give equal time to teaching and trying to improve...." (18, page 92)

"....Students feel the colleges should pay more attention to them as

individuals, faculty are worried about pressures for accountability and the lack of stimulating environments, and administrators would like to run a tighter ship.... Research on the college's effect on students....typically show little impact....once their characteristics as freshmen are taken into account...." (18, page 94)

The writer tends to agree with Menges' statements above, having read many such studies and observed and worked in the college atmosphere for half his career. However, the statement which follows is questionable.

"....Students can describe classroom events without having to judge their value.... They can report their perceptions of classroom atmosphere without having to assess the instructor's personality...." (18, page 60)

In fact, the writer would go so far as to say that perceived value of an event influences a person's judgment of the event and that students' assessments of the teacher's personality is a necessary prerequisite to their perception of classroom atmosphere, because teacher personality so vitally affects the classroom atmosphere. A statement by Smith, Bruner, and White in 1956 reminds us that personality is not excludable from opinion-making. "....Our studies convinced us that both intellectual and temperamental qualities can be reflected in opinions...." (25, page 253)

The Relationship Between Teaching and Learning in College

The idea of identifying who is a good teacher and who is a poor teacher is not repugnant to people who subscribe to the one-to-one relational scheme (i.e., that good teaching will produce high achievement, or to those who say that high student achievement is a major criterion in their concept of "good teacher." Louis T. Benezet (1973) expressed concern about this assumption when he wrote:

"....The existence of a one-to-one relationship between college learning and college teaching has always been an article of faith more than a demonstrated truth...." (4, page 4)

The question that plagues researchers is always that of how to measure the quality one wants to measure validly. Is an achievement test, usually constructed by the course instructor, a valid measure of student learning, or is the student self-report, such as "I learned a lot" or "I didn't learn much," a more valid indicator of student learning? Numerous writers express faith in the student as the best barometer of how much is learned. Therefore, instructor rating forms will many times ask the student to respond to certain items constructed to measure his perception of how much he learned, if not directly, indirectly by inference from his assessment of other aspects of the course. The writer borrows heavily from Robert J. Menges (1973) in including four models for evaluating teaching/learning below.

1. "The 'standard' (measuring teaching success by student performance on previously stated behavioral objectives) model....is rational and clear; it forces teachers and evaluators to define their teaching goals and seek evidence that their aims are being met....it assesses the teacher as an attainer of stipulated goals.... The difficulties stem from the problems of formulating goals and its formality without a theoretical set of ideas to serve as a guide to action. (18, page 81)

2. The general approach....is to assume the basic correctness of the ideas of cognitive psychologists, to develop devices to assess those teacher behaviors that demonstrate the use of these ideas, and finally to 'evaluate' how well teachers implement them. One advantage is that it is based on a set of theoretical, well-researched ideas that can

be used to improve instruction.... The evaluator can use these ideas to suggest specific actions to help the teacher become more effective (such as the use of advance organizers or the reorganization of material into more logical sequences).... It may call for classroom observations or approaches similar to those used to assess microteaching, if not microteaching itself. (18, page 83)

3. The reinforcement model suggests rating the teacher on how well he (1) directs/captures students' attention, (2) provides for or arouses motivation to learn, (3) maintains student interest, (4) provides immediate feedback, (5) allows student to progress at own rate, (6) avoids excessive student frustration and failure, (7) promotes transfer of learning to situations outside the classroom, and (8) develops and preserves positive attitudes toward self, the teacher, the subject matter, and the learning process in general. (18, page 84)

4. Finally, the analysis of roles and role expectations, and how well the teacher plays them or meets them, is another approach. The teacher's role may be either clearly or vaguely, consciously or unconsciously defined by himself, his students, his superiors, or all his 'other publics.'" (18, page 87)

"Much of what the teacher is expected to do in the classroom will be determined by the setting in which he is imbedded. Whatever the setting, the teacher's role seems to have some built-in conflicts. First, must he be loyal to his institution or loyal to his discipline? Second, must his educational level determine his earned income level? Third, must his teaching take precedence over his research activity (or vice versa) and must his research activity take

precednece over his ethical/moral training?" (18, page 89)

"The university culture is criticized often (as noted by Sarason in 1971) and one can see role conflicts in those criticism. Some are training for teaching vs. interest in teaching, promotion policies vs. quality of teaching or student opinion, subject matter vs. student needs, time for scholarly pursuits vs. time with students, college life vs. real life, town vs. gown, change vs. tradition, and bureaucracy vs. economy or parsimony. One may adopt a priority list to deal with the variety of expectations but the inelastic nature of them and the way people with different personalities react to these commitments leads to some problems." (18, pages 90-91)

The writer believes in all these models, even though not one of them is without major problems. As a learning theorist and as an educational psychologist, he accepts all the points made as applicable to the assessment of good college level instruction, as for instruction at any level, for that matter. Most evaluation schemes dreamed up for quantitatively assessing "teaching effectiveness" as a criterion for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions utilize parts or all of the ideas expressed in the first three models mentioned by Menges. The fourth model is also utilized, but usually broken into two separate criteria variously called "research and scholarly activity' and "university and community service." All of the models necessarily involve personalities of the evaluators with the possible exception of the first one.

There have been attempts to improve college teaching by adopting schemes variously referred to as "management by objectives." So long as one is formulating objectives only in the domain of the intellect or cognition the scheme may be relatively free of personal bias, but when a criterion level of attainment is set, affect begins to creep in. And what about affective objectives themselves?

Recently, the writer read an evaluation of a teacher written by her superior. While cognitive elements were plentiful, in the final summation suggesting "goals to work toward," it was evident that affect had a definite place in the mind and scheme of the teacher's immediate superior. Therefore, even the first model will be subject to the "personality effect" of both parties.

Some studies have attempted to correlate some items commonly found on instructor rating scales with student achievement measures. Factor analyses have identified clusters of items which all seem to measure the same characteristic, and the factors so identified have then been correlated with measures of student achievement. John A. Centra (1977) reported.

"....Global ratings of teacher effectiveness and of the value of the course were most highly related to mean exam performance.... Ratings of course objectives and organizations and quality of lectures were also fairly well coorelated with achievement. Ratings of other aspects, such as teacher-student relationship or the difficulty-workload of the course, were not highly related to achievement scores...." (5)

Centra's study would seem to indicate that general factors, more than specific items, may be most useful to analyze by such means. Reed G. Williams and John E. Ware, Jr. (1977) reported on the relationship of certain items in student ratings of lectures with their achievement measures after exposure to the lecturers who varied their presentations. "....Higher achievement was associated with high content coverage and high expressiveness. Students gave higher ratings to expressive lectures; student satisfaction ratings reflected real differences in content coverage and student achievement with low expressive presentations, but not when the lectures were high expressive... No changes were noted after a second lecture...." (28)

R. Gene Hoffman (1978) reported the following relationships between rating items and criterion scores. "....Student Involvement and Overall Satisfaction received the strongest support of relevance for the Outcome Interest criterion. Instructor Knowledge and Skills and Overall Satisfaction have the strongest and most consistent associations with student learnings...." (14)

The studies cited in this section do indicate that other factors than student or instructor personality are involved in amount learned, at least. But this achievement level, does it affect ratings of instructors to a greater degree than other factors?

Situational and Other Pre-Determined Student Characteristics Affecting Instructor and Institution Ratings

Various studies and reviews of studies have advanced the notion that many situational variables are partially, if not wholly, associated with the level of ratings students give to their instructors and the institutions they attend. Alexander Astin (1978) reported. "....Men and students with high intellectual self-esteem are most likely to be satisfied with student-faculty relations. Satisfaction is lowest among women, political liberals, and students high in hedonism or artistic interest....low satisfaction is associated with teachers' colleges, technological institutions and large universities.... The strongest involvement factor associated with satisfaction with student-faculty relations is student-faculty interaction.... Men and students with high intellectual self-esteem are most likely to be satisfied with the quality of classroom instruction.... Also more likely to be satisfied with the quality of classroom instruction are students attending highly selective institutions and single-sex colleges.... Satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction is lowest in teachers' colleges and large universities.... Public institutions in general

produce substantially lower satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction than do private institutions....degree of student academic involvement and student-faculty interaction are also associated with satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction...." (1, pages 171-3)

Harvey M. Rich and Pamela M. Jolicoeur (1978) in a study of college students in California described some similar and additional relationships. "....Students with higher GPA's perceive greater faculty concern for students and also rate their schools more highly.... Students at large colleges perceive faculty as more remote and less accessible and also rate their schools lower overall.... Year in college is positively associated with faculty attention to students, but negatively related to the rating of the college.... Commuters rate their colleges less highly. Students at public colleges rate their schools less highly than do students at private colleges. Students at secular schools rate them more highly than do students at church-related schools...." (21, page 18)

Isaac I. Bejar and Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr. (1975, 1978) investigated whether curriculum area had significant relationship with student ratings of instructors. "....Only one factor, Definition of Student Responsibility, is stable for all instructors and all subject divisions.... Broadmindedness is stable across Humanities and Social Science as is Empathy/Clarity/Stimulation.... Course Coordination is weak but stable across Social Science and Science/Mathematics...." (2, page 5)

"....MANOVA revealed a significant relationship between student ratings and curriculum area, but not between ratings and course format.... Scales significant in the curriculum effect were Was Approachable, Feedback Readily Available, and Help Available When Needed.... Highest associations were found in the Communications/Language/Symbolic Systems (German, Speech, Logic) curriculum area, next highest in Artistic Expression (Music, Theatre) curriculum area, and lowest

in the Man and Society (Sociology, Economics) curriculum area...." (3)

It could be argued, of course, whether the rating scales, which students are asked to complete, reflect dimensions peculiar to one or the other area or whether teachers in those areas are more skillful or cognizant of what students like or whether students and teachers match up better there because of similar experiences, goals and the like. Sophisticated statistical techniques of "equalizing" such effects across disciplines and instructors seem to negate all those arguments. One study seemed to indicate that regardless of the instrument used, the curriculum area, or any other external factor, students base their evaluations of instructors on previous experiences with instructors. Susan K. Whitely and Kenneth O. Doyle (1976) referred to this construct as students' implicit theories about the organization of teaching characteristics. "....The current study finds that students' implicit theories....represent an important and apparently valid part of the rating process. These results seem to suggest that the role of implicit theories should be maximized in construction of student rating instruments....the distinctions between various teaching behaviors required by the rater will more accurately represent his frame of reference for evaluating teaching.... Students' implicit theories were reflected in the factors regardless of the type of data...." (27)

Two other researchers, Richard D. Shingles (1977) and James R. Larson, Jr. (1979) suggest other ways to minimize the effect of student pre-conceived notions or other "irrelevant" factors on the ratings they give instructors. "....The known irrelevant factors which color student evaluations of faculty can be treated statistically to adjust for these factors. Multiple regression analysis is one technique.... If evaluation scores are not treated or adjusted in some fashion, their use for tenure and merit decisions should be stopped...." (23)

"....Students' implicit theories about the way specific teacher behaviors

covary are reasonable but may not be accurate.... Other techniques must be used to demonstrate their accuracy.... Controlled experiments with laboratory data, rather than measures of naturally occurring behavior, are methods to use...." (16)

Finally, Laura A. Driscoll and William L. Goodwin (1979) suggest that simply informing students about the use and disposition of their ratings can have considerable effect on the level of the ratings. "....Average student ratings of professors and courses differ according to the type of information provided students about the use and disposition of the results. When compared with no information of that type, information about (1) use of the results for course improvement, (2) use of the results for promotion, tenure, and salary decisions, and (3) both these uses plus information that the professor will ultimately receive the results, all tend to elevate average ratings.... In any case, the information provided, especially with respect to the first two uses listed above, should be standard across all instructors and disciplines within the university...." (9)

Since it has been shown that there are some situational or other pre-determined factors affecting student ratings of their instructors and instruction, it seems reasonable to assume that another such might indeed be student need structures or other personality factors. Another pertinent question at this point might be, "Do students and their teachers agree on what constitutes effective teaching?" or "Does the instructor know when he is being a good teacher?"

Do Teachers See Teachers as Students See Teachers?

The studies that were reported in previous sections of this paper did not really argue the validity of student ratings of college teachers except in an indirect fashion (i.e., trying to account for a variety of variables which affect the ratings, thus affecting their validity). Herbert W. Marsh (1977), however,

did purport to statistically test validity by comparing ratings on several factors given to sets of instructors previously identified as most outstanding and least outstanding by graduates of the institution. "....The classroom evaluations of the most outstanding instructors were consistently higher than those of the least outstanding instructors on all evaluation scores except Difficulty/Workload. No differences were found due to background variables of the course, the students, or the teacher's experience." (17)

There have been a number of studies and reviews which have dealt with student expectations, correlates of rating items and factors, and the definition of what each party means by the term good teacher. Robert J. Menges (1973) contributed further comments worthy of inclusion at this point. "....Conclusions can be drawn about what characteristics tend to be associated but nothing can be concluded about causality...." (18, page 64)

"....Freshmen students expect their professors to be stimulating, engaging, vital, and friendly. By the time they are seniors they lower their expectations considerably but still expect professors to be reasonably well-organized, well-informed in their subject, reasonable in work demand, and fair in grading...." (18, page 88)

The accumulation of experience, then, probably brings student expectations more in line with teacher self-expectations. Charles A. Goldsmid, James E. Gruber, and Everett K. Wilson (1977) and Doris M. Miller (1974) had some thoughts on those lines.

"....The imputed attributes of superior teachers described, chiefly, teaching techniques. Far fewer personal and professional traits were mentioned.... The optimum set of traits imputed to superior teachers combines command of subject matter, concern for students, and techniques for conveying that competence and

conscientiousness." (12)

"....It would seem that faculty place heavier weight on that aspect of their role which calls for demonstration of knowledge and professional skill, and the delivery of information. Students, on the other hand, see the more affective, personally supportive aspects of the complex teacher role as differentially critical to their learning...." (19)

The expectation of students for instructors to be personally supportive, as well as knowledgeable was further substantiated by Barbara R. Sherman and Robert T. Blackburn (1974) in their study and their comparisons with other earlier studies. They measured student ratings by a semantic differential instrument and analyzed the factors.

"....A five-factor solution provided four distinct personality components.... I: Personal Potency: The personally potent teacher is seen as one who is highly attractive and who, by virtue of this attractiveness, is able to exert considerable influence over his students. The picture is that of a dynamic, outgoing individual, who, at the same time, communicates well with students and has a relaxed attitude. It is thought that factors resembling personal potency reported by other researchers have been the systematized energy spoken of by Nunnally, Thistlethwaite, and Wolfe in 1963, lethargy vs. energy spoken of by Solomon, Bezdek, and Rosenberg in 1964, teaching dynamism spoken of by Guls in 1966, and potency spoken of by Schein and Hall in 1967...." (22)

"II: Pragmatism: It appears to indicate a 'common sense' or 'down-to-earth' dimension which students perceive as an important ingredient in effectiveness. It is thought to resemble the organization behavior spoken of by Gibb in 1955, and the structure spoken of by Isaacson, McKeachie, and Milholland in 1963, and again by Deshpande, Webb, and Marks in 1970." (22)

"III: Amicability: Interpersonal sensitivity is apparent in this pattern.... Sensitiveness, openmindedness, and acceptance, on the part of the faculty, are

especially important to students, with reasonableness and graciousness also desirable attributes. This is thought to resemble the empathy spoken of by Smalzreid and Remmers in 1943 and Coffman in 1954, empathetic spoken of by Bendig in 1955, friendly, democratic behavior spoken of by Gibb in 1955, warmth-coldness spoken of by Solomon, Bezdek, and Rosenberg in 1964, acceptance-change spoken of by Schein and Hall in 1967, and rapport spoken of by Deshpande, Webb, and Marks in 1966...." (22)

"IV: Intellectual Competency: Clearly, expertise, knowledge, and wisdom are essential aspects of this concept which also includes decisiveness and stability as well as rational, sensible behavior. This factor is thought to resemble the academic emphasis spoken of by Gibb in 1955, competence spoken of by Bendig in 1955 and Schein and Hall in 1967, skill spoken of by Isaacson, McKeachie, and Mulholland in 1963, content mastery spoken of by Deshpande, Webb, and Marks in 1970, and analytic-synthetic spoken of by Hildebrand and Wilson in 1970...." (22)

"....The evidence leans toward the importance of personal characteristics as they contribute to perceived instructional effectiveness.... It seems reasonable that personality characteristics are more enduring and therefore more difficult to change than are other measures of teaching effectiveness.... A professor wishing to improve his perceived effectiveness may best begin on personal attributes rather than focusing his energy on course functions and activities which seem readily alterable...." (22)

The dual role of personality factors and knowledge/skills in effective college instruction has been repeatedly shown, but it is still unclear as to which carries greater weight with the party doing the rating. Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr. and Patricia L. Webber (1978) did explore instructor self-ratings as a source of information with regard to relationships within their own scheme of

of factors that make for effective teaching. "....Instructor ratings of their own overall teaching ability correlated significantly with their own estimates of how much their students learned, even though instructors see teaching ability and student learning as distinctly different.... 'Getting students interested' in the material consistently emerged as the best single correlate of 'student learning'.... 'Presented material clearly' is the strongest correlate of 'overall teaching ability'.... There seems to be a constellation of motivation-related items (enjoyment of teaching, liking for the subject, getting students interested, perceived student motivation) which contribute to instructor definition of good teaching and learning!" (8)

Apparently then, in instructors' opinions, if they themselves feel good about what they are doing and how they are relating, they convince themselves that they are good teachers. But are they? Student opinion has been known to differ. And well it might, for the key to all this is individual perception, and that is known to vary considerably within, between, and among individuals and groups!

The Case for Personality Factors

If the reader is not already convinced that personality elements in both students and teachers are of considerable influence in both parties' conceptions of what constitutes good teaching and learning, further comments from some writers already cited, and some reported for the first time, are submitted here to build the rationale for the original study reported later. George A. Kelly (1970) stated a possible determining element in something he called the Commonality Corollary. "....To the extent that one person employs a construction of experience similar to that employed by another, his processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person.... This does not mean they must experience similar events - only that their constructions of their personal experiences

must be similar...." (15, page 20)

Do constructs and constructions of experiences include one's personal interpretations and remembrances complete with all the individual perceptions and values as parts? Indeed, they do. Esther Raushenbush (1964) said it directly. "....There is no serious learning, no instruction, without deep involvement of the person, his feelings, and his beliefs...." (20, page 140)

George D. Handley (1973) puts it another way. "....The judgments of pupils are of considerable importance, but there is more to teacher effectiveness than being liked by one's pupils.... Rating presupposes criteria and these cannot escape subjectivity.... The grade given is likely to reflect the degree of similarities between the educational philosophies of the rater and the ratee, or the degree of rapport between their personalities...." (13, page 85)

Several studies have been done seeking to link various personality types or personality traits in students to preferred personality types, traits, or teaching techniques which bring about the most effective learning. Albert B. Smith and Richard K. Irey (1974) reported on some of their findings at an AERA convention. Part of their rationale and findings are as follows. "....Subjects' types were arrived at by scoring four pairs of preferences on the Meyer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), (1) Extraversion-Introversion, (2) Sensing-Intuition, (3) Thinking-Feeling, and (4) Judging-Perception.... If a college student learns most naturally out of the kind of perception and kind of judgment he perceives, then the most effective college teaching will be that which matches teaching methods to the student's mode of perceiving and judging...."

"....Sensing types apparently do dislike new or abstract problems unless there are standard ways to solve them.... They also seem to prefer established routine, are patient with learning activities that focus on detail, and do well at precise work.... Intuitive types seem to like solving new problems that

focus on the world of ideas. They dislike repetition and grow impatient with college teaching that focuses on routine details or that requires a lot of precision...."

"....Introverted students were more willing to attend supplemental lectures than were extraverts. Extraverted students use course reference supplements more so than introverts. Extraverts took more quizzes and spent longer time on them than did introverts. Extraverts thought quizzes fulfilled the purpose of verifying mastery of content/objectives. Extraverts also saw quizzes as contributing to their learning or mastery...." (24)

A personality factor investigated by Richard L. Daniels and James P. Stevens (1976) was locus of control orientation. Although not easy to measure, there are some people who perceive that most major decisions are made by other factors or controlling influences outside the self and are happy with that state of affairs. Others perceive that the self is the true controller and are happy with that state of affairs. "....Those students identified as external locus of control oriented performed better under the teacher-controlled method of instruction (lecture, reading assignment, tests, conventional norm-referenced grading, minimal discussion) while those identified as internal locus of control oriented performed better under the contract-for-grade method of instruction (student selection of area focus, specific projects, optional lectures-readings-tests, required small group disucssions weekly under a teaching assistant about problem areas or student questions, guaranteed grade if contract fulfilled and work was accepted...." (7)

George D. Handley (1973) had some ideas on extraversion-introversion also in teacher training. "....Extraverts should make better primary/middle school teachers and introverts better secondary and university teachers....extraverts are more attracted to teaching but there are no clear indications that they are better at it...." (13, page 90)

"....Stability, whether brought about by temperamental or environmental factors, is clearly related to success in teaching...." (13, page 93)

Stability, as Handley speaks of it, probably includes both personal mental-emotional stability as well as or more than job stability, although the latter often contributes to the former. Mervin B. Freedman (1967) touched on a personality factor called authoritarianism. "....Seniors also score significantly lower than freshmen on measures of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism is a personality syndrome which has yet to be defined with precision. It is never-the-less predictive of behavior in a variety of situations. Among many traits which are considered to be expressions of an authoritarian tendency are compulsiveness, rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity, punitive morality, submission to power, conventionality, cynicism, and anti-intraception...." (11, page 29)

Presumably, then, with freshman one would have to be careful about allowing too much freedom of choice, ambiguous objectives, and take a more authoritarian stance while with seniors the opposite would not be too bad an idea. Thomas J. Cottle (1977) seems to reflect the tendency in the last two decades to be both self-introspective and self-assertive among college students (and some of their professors) and suggests that more allowance be made for students talking about themselves. "....Without demeaning the tradition of academic relevance and the changes it created in the structure of higher education....it must be said that whereas much of the energy for this transformation was directed toward changing fundamental educational percepts, some of the energy also was channeled into satisfying the impulse to talk about oneself to teachers.... (6, page 89)

"....Demanding relevance, then, was a group of students and teachers who hoped that through a new form of education, the values of intellectual capacities and experiences might be equalized, and that, as a consequence of all this,

all people might again be able to believe in what for years they had cherished as their talents, native abilities, and just plain good fortune...." (6, page 90)

"....More accurately (than just to hear their own voice) students want to examine the content of their own minds in classrooms in the presence of legitimate and trustworthy authority.... They want to be heard (not just by peers) by people whose evaluations contain an added weight.... Relationships with peers, although important, never fully compensate for the lack of contact with valued adults.... It is not surprising, therefore, that the idea of a university in which students are left totally on their own will not be satisfactory to those students who want to reach their teachers, their elders, their superiors...." (6, page 92-3)

"....Why should the habit of talking to parents or siblings about relevant aspects of one's life, which one highly values, be given up on entry into college?" (6, page 100)

For the self-identity seekers, Cottle is probably right in suggesting that an instructor should allow more student talk and interaction with himself, freely communicating his perceptions and agreement/disagreement with such students' ruminations without being destructive or vindictive. But unless the instructor approves a student comment, wouldn't the student feel devalued? What would happen then to the student self-image?

George D. Handley (1973) had some additional comment in support of instructors utilizing student personality data in planning teaching strategy. "....That particular teaching strategies may be more effective with one type of personality than with another is suggested...." (13, page 78)

"....Working under a particular teacher will be experienced as rewarding by the pupil if the teacher is able to meet his needs in some way. Both cognitive needs and affective needs must be met, in differing proportions according

to pupil type..." (13, pages 100-101)

"....Sometimes, harmonious interaction occurs naturally.... At other times, modification of styles must take place to secure meshing (of student needs with instructional methods).... Pupils are less likely to modify their styles because they are (1) usually less capable, and (2) they see it as the teacher's task to arouse motivation...." (13, page 106)

Robert J. Menges (1973) seemed to echo the same feeling when he said: "....No one method or style of teaching is clearly superior for all students, all purposes, all teachers. It is the mix or combination of styles for a given course and its students, or between teaching style and learning style that is probably most important...." (18, page 104)

Barbara R. Sherman and Robert T. Blackburn (1974) in discussing their findings, as reported earlier in this paper, concluded that teacher personality data could be useful. "....These results are similar to those of Maslow and Zimmerman in 1956 who obtained a significant correlation between student ratings of instructors as teachers and as personalities.... These findings are important, for they demonstrate the possibility of predicting a faculty member's success in the classroom on the basis of his perceived personality characteristics...." (22)

Albert B. Smith and Richard K. Irey (1974) went even further. "....Knowledge of a student's preferences for receiving information can be used to predict his reactions to various teaching models or instructional strategies or vice versa.... Knowledge of a student's personality type or learning style can be useful....in designing more effective college instruction.... It is possible to know in advance which type of instruction will excite particular types of students.... The self-paced course that favors only the cognitive style of the intuitive type student is likely to fail to meet the needs of many students....

Personality type data can be used by college teachers to enhance their student ratings.... Students rate more highly those learning/teaching experiences which match the students' learning styles...." (24)

The studies in this section so far have suggested strongly that both student and teacher personality types have profound effect on student ratings of college teachers and that personality data on each party could be used to improve college teaching/learning. A final study for this section of this paper establisned through statistically sound techniques that a match-up between student personality needs and instructor behavior which is perceived to meet those needs does indeed result in higher ratings. Toby J. Tetenbaum (1975) demonstrated through graduate student ratings of 12 vignettes of teacher behavior that their measured personality needs strongly influenced the ratings given to the vignettes, which described teacher behaviors oriented toward meeting those needs. Tetenbaum's findings are partially reported here.

"....Overall patterns revealed highest mean ratings to the teacher perceived as meeting the Gregariousness-Dependency need cluster, especially affiliation, next highest to teachers perceived as meeting the Intellectual Striving need cluster, especially understanding and achievement, third highest to teachers perceived as meeting the Control needs cluster, especially cognitive structure and order, although the endurance need under the Intellectual Striving cluster was equivalent. Lowest ratings were to teachers perceived as meeting the Ascendancy needs cluster. Even the one perceived as meeting the need to avoid impulsivity (in the Control cluster) and the one perceived as meeting the need for succorance (in the Gregariousness-Dependency cluster) and the one perceived as meeting the need for autonomy (in the Gregariousness-Dependency cluster) were rated equivalent to the one perceived as meeting the need for defendence (in the Ascendancy cluster).... The findings clearly demonstrate that specific

needs were related to the ratings of specific teacher orientations. The strongest was the clear relationship for the Control need cluster.... By demonstrating that ratings involve a perceptual task which is affected by the perceiver's needs, attention is drawn to the necessity for approaching the administration and interpretations rationally and within a broader theoretical framework...." (26)

A Four Year Study of Student Ratings of Teacher Types

Purpose

The study reported here was initially seen as a collapsed partial replication of the Tetenbaum (1975) study mentioned earlier in this paper, with less sophisticated rationale and analysis. The assumption was that Tetenbaum's structure of the vignettes and the statistical rationale for them was appropriate and valid. An additional reason for conducting this study was to try to identify a pattern of need structures in undergraduate teacher education students at Western Illinois University which would be helpful in planning instructional strategy to better meet those needs. The research reported earlier in this paper suggests that, as a strong possibility. Finally, the study was conceived of as an addition to the general body of research conducted on the issue of student ratings of college teachers and their uses.

Method

The general research method is descriptive in nature and utilizes the self-report measuring technique as applied to college student samples.

Subjects

The samples were selected from students enrolled in random modules taught

by the instructor as part of a required junior level course in educational psychology. Students from all sections and all academic specialties were represented. The approximate breakdown was 1/3 special education majors, 1/3 elementary education majors, and 1/3 secondary education majors in ten or more academic specialties. All were preparing to be certified public school teachers in the state of Illinois. The ratio of females to males was approximately two to one. In addition to the directions on the instrument, subjects were told that their responses would constitute data for a research study and that the exercise was not related to anything in the module they were currently studying.

Instrument

The self report instrument was a single sheet of paper on which appeared four vignettes describing teacher orientations a la the Tetenbaum need clusters. Subjects were asked to rank the four vignettes from one to four, giving one to the teacher they believed they would rate the highest and four to the teacher they would rate the lowest. The instrument appears in Figure 1. The letters identifying the one associated with which need structure did not appear on the copies completed by the students.

Procedure

Each spring term, subjects selected as noted above were asked to complete the instrument at the beginning of the first day of module attendance except in 1979, when they were asked to complete it on the last day of the course during a general course and instructor evaluation session involving other instruments as well. Subjects were asked not to put their names on the instrument. An occasional subject failed to complete the ranking or gave two vignettes

AN INVENTORY

If you, as a college student, were asked to rate several of your instructors who acted as described in the four examples below, which would you rate higher? Please rank these four by writing a 1 in front of the description you would rate the highest, a 2 by the one you would rate next highest, and so on.

C

_____ A teacher who organizes and structures all lessons and assignments so that you know what is expected of you, who also stresses order, neatness, clarity, and logic, and who also encourages deliberation of thought and moderation of emotions.

IS

_____ A teacher who challenges your mental abilities and your ability to persevere at a difficult task, who also alludes to future rewards and satisfactions to be obtained through your present efforts, who also provides problem-solving tasks requiring integration and synthesis of all your learnings, and who also evaluates you mostly against a criterion of excellence.

GD

_____ A teacher who encourages you to work together and share your problems, who also helps you to become more sensitive to yourself and others, and who frequently directs reassuring and supportive comments to you or to the whole class.

A

_____ A teacher who encourages arguments and debates featuring aggressive and sometimes hostile verbalizations, who also praises your own defensiveness, and who also sometimes is critical of you and creates situations where you can be critical of others.

Figure 1: Ranking Instrument

equal rankings. Those were not excluded from the results.

Data Analysis

Simple frequency counts of the number of times each teacher vignette received each rank were tallied for the total sample each year and recorded in cells as illustrated in Table 1. Frequences were then converted to percentages of the total sample assigning that rank. The total for all four samples appears in Table 2. Mean ranks for each vignette over the yearly samples and total sample are shown in Table 3.

Results

Inspection of the tables shows a fairly consistent pattern of highest rankings for that teacher perceived as meeting Gregariousness-Dependency needs, followed in order by those perceived as meeting Control Needs, Intellectual Striving needs, and Ascendancy Needs. It is less clear for the 1979 sample since the first three teacher types received approximately the same mean rank.

Discussion

The pattern of rankings was similar to that shown by Tetenbaum (1975), but with the second and third ranking teacher-types juxtaposed. The apparent deviation of the 1979 sample probably does not represent a shift in the pattern in terms of either student need structures or their perceptions of teachers. More likely, the time of the sampling and the "set" it produced, that is, during a larger evaluation session students may have applied the rankings to teachers of the modules for the course even though they were told it had nothing to do with the other evaluation tasks, probably accounts for the failure to distinguish between teacher-types.

Table 1: Rankings of Teacher-Types by Samples of College Students Each Year for a Four-Year Period

Teacher Type	Sample Year	Frequency/Percentage of Ranks 1	2	3	4	N
1-Control	76	44/27.8	59/37.3	43/27.2	12/07.6	158
	77	50/34.5	49/33.7	41/28.3	05/03.4	145
	78	42/33.1	44/34.6	29/22.8	12/09.4	127
	79	20/26.8	23/32.9	22/31.4	05/07.1	070
2-Intellectual Striving	76	48/30.4	44/27.8	49/31.0	17/10.8	158
	77	27/18.6	40/27.6	66/45.5	12/08.3	145
	78	34/26.8	34/26.8	49/38.6	10/07.9	127
	79	23/32.9	20/28.6	19/27.1	08/11.4	070
3-Gregarious-Dependency	76	61/38.6	44/27.8	47/29.7	06/03.8	158
	77	65/44.8	50/34.5	26/17.9	04/02.8	145
	78	51/40.1	41/32.3	26/20.5	09/07.1	127
	79	22/31.4	21/30.0	21/30.0	06/08.6	070
	76	04/02.5	13/08.2	20/12.7	121/76.6	158
	77	08/05.5	05/03.4	17/11.7	115/79.3	145
	78		08/06.3	23/18.1	96/75.6	127
	79		05/07.1	10/14.3	55/78.6	070

Table 2: Rankings of Teacher-Types by 500 College Students Over a Four-Year Period

Teacher Type	Frequency/Percentage of Ranks 1	2	3	4	N
1-Control	156/31.2	175/35.0	135/27.0	034/06.8	500
2-Intellectual Striving	132/26.4	138/27.6	183/36.6	047/09.4	500
3-Gregarious-Dependent	199/39.8	156/31.2	120/24.0	025/05.0	500
4-Ascendancy	012/02.4	031/06.2	070/14.0	387/77.4	500

Table 3: Mean Rankings of Teacher-Types by Yearly Sample and Total Sample

Teacher Type	1976	1977	1978	1979	Total
1-Control	2.15	2.01	2.02	2.17	2.09
2-Intellectual Striving	2.22	2.43	2.28	2.17	2.27
3-Gregarious-Dependent	1.99	1.79	1.70	2.16	1.94
4-Ascendancy	3.63	3.65	3.69	3.86	3.66

Conclusions

It seems clear that different type students prefer different type instructors. The type is apparently a function of naturally occurring needs in the students' personalities and naturally occurring teacher behaviors which students perceive as meeting their needs, whether or not they are aware of such a matchup. What does all this mean for the instructor who truly desires to meet all his students' needs? It suggests that, given a way to identify the needs of his students at the outset of his instruction, the college teacher should include in his methodology strategies designed to meet the identified needs, roughly in proportion to the number of various need-types or clusters discovered.

If it wouldn't violate any moral/ethical codes, the teacher might administer or cause to be administered some needs assessment device, probably a set of personality scales, to students early in the course, plan strategies based on the findings, and try them out. After assessing the strategies and refining them, a given teacher ought to be able to offer a number of alternatives to students at the outset, suggesting that certain ones follow the strategy which he, the instructor, thinks will meet their needs.

The instrument used in this study might be considered as a crude measure of student needs. Instructor efforts along such lines should pay off, in the long run, with improved student learning and improved teacher ratings by those same students.

Regarding the use of student ratings of college instruction as part of teacher evaluation, the real issue is how much weight they should carry. This study cannot provide the answer, but does fall in line with all those others which suggest interpretation of such ratings with caution and relative temperance rather than as absolute measures of teaching effectiveness.

The college teacher, as does any teacher, has a responsibility to meet

the varying needs of his students. It should come as no surprise, then, that this responsibility makes it necessary to develop skill in a variety of methodologies and keep from getting into the proverbial rut of a single teaching style. An alternative perhaps worth considering is the "teaming" of three to four instructors, each of whom is known to be skillful in meeting a different set of needs, to deliver a given course to several sections of students. Logistical and scheduling problems would work against such a team approach. Asking one teacher to "do it all," on the other hand, may doom most efforts to failure or mediocrity at the most.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Alexander W. Astin, Four Critical Years, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1978.

2. Isaac I. Bejar and Kenneth O. Doyle, "Generalizability of Factor Structures Underlying Student Ratings of Instruction," University of Minnesota, Measurement Service Center, Minneapolis, 1975 (Unpublished Manuscript).

3. Isaac I. Bejar and Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr., "Relationship of Curriculum Area and Course Format with Student Ratings of Instruction," American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15(4), 483-7.

4. Louis T. Benezet in C. Robert Pace (Ed.), Evaluating Learning and Teaching, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1973.

5. John A. Centra, "Student Ratings of Instruction and Their Relationship to Learning," American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(1), 17-24.

6. Thomas J. Cottle, College - Reward and Betrayal, University of Chicago Press, 1977.

7. Richard L. Daniels and James P. Stevens, "The Interaction Between the Internal-External Locus of Control and Two Methods of College Instruction," American Educational Research Journal, 1976, 13(2), 103-13.

8. Kenneth O. Doyle, Jr. and Patricia L. Webber, "Self Ratings of College Instruction," American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15(3), 467-75.

9. Laura A. Driscoll and William L. Goodwin, "The Effects of Varying Information about Use and Disposition of Results on University Students' Evaluation of Faculty and Courses," American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16(1), 25-37.

10. Margaret B. Fisher and Jeanne L. Noble, College Education as Personal Development, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1960.

11. Mervin B. Freedman, The College Experience, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1967.

12. Charles L. Goldsmid, James E. Gruber, and Everett K. Wilson, "Perceived Attributes of Superior Teachers (PAST): An Inquiry Into the Giving of Teacher Awards," American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(4), 423-40.

13. George D. Handley, Personality, Learning, and Teaching, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973.

14. R. Gene Hoffman, "Variables Affecting University Student Ratings of Faculty Behavior," American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15(2), 287-99.

15. George A. Kelly, "A Brief Introduction to Personal Construct Theory," in D. Bannister (Ed.) Perspectives on Personal Construct Theory, Academic Press, London, 1970.

16. James R. Larson, Jr., "The Limited Utility of Factor Analytic Techniques for the Study of Implicit Theories in Student Ratings of Teacher Behavior," American Educational Research Journal, 1979, 16(2), 201-11.

17. Herbert W. Marsh, "The Validity of Students' Evaluations: Classroom Evaluations of Instructors Independently Nominated as Best and Worst Teachers by Graduating Seniors," American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(4), 441-7.

18. Robert J. Menges in C. Robert Pace (Ed.), Evaluating Learning and Teaching, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1973.

19. Doris M. Miller, "Discrepancies Between Students and Faculty in the Appraisal of Critical Teaching Practices," A Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, 1974 (Unpublished Manuscript).

20. Esther Raushenbush, The Student and His Studies, Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, 1964.

21. Harvey M. Rich and Pamela M. Jolicoeur, Student Attitudes and Academic Environments: A Study of California Higher Education, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1978.

22. Barbara R. Sherman and Robert T. Blackburn, "Personal Characteristics and Teacher Effectiveness of College Faculty," A Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, 1974 (Unpublished Manuscript).

23. Richard D. Shingles, "Faculty Ratings: Procedures for Interpreting Student Evaluations," American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(4), 459-70.

24. Albert B. Smith and Richard K. Irey, "Personality Variables and the Improvement of College Teaching," A Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, 1974 (Unpublished Manuscript).

25. M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White, Opinions and Personality, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1956.

26. Toby J. Tetenbaum, "The Role of Student Needs and Teacher Orientation in Student Ratings of Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12(4), 417-33.

27. Susan K. Whitely and Kenneth O. Doyle, "Implicit Theories in Student Ratings," American Educational Research Journal, 1976, 13(4), 241-53.

28. Reed G. Williams and John E. Ware, Jr., "An Extended Visit with Dr. Fox: Validity of Student Satisfaction with Instruction Ratings After Repeated Exposure to a Lecturer," American Educational Research Journal, 1977, 14(4), 449-57.

29. Daniel Yankelovich, The New Morality: A Profile of American Youth in the 70's, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1974.